

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
FOR THE  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**February 20, 2003  
MINUTES**

The one hundred and thirty-seventh meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Secretary Geoff Kline called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m.

Attending the meeting were: Neil Cullen, Meg Monroe, Corinne Goodrich, Ruben Niño, Parviz Mokhtari, Ray Davis, Craig Ewing, Van Ocampo, Geoff Kline, Mo Sharma, Larry Patterson, Joe Hurley (Transportation Authority), Christine Maley-Grubl (Alliance), Brian Lee (San Mateo County Public Works), Onnolee Trapp (CMAQ), Sirous Dialamian (Caltrans), Kenneth Folem (MTC), Dianna Lee (SamTrans), Mark Duino, Kent Dewell, Richard Napier and Walter Martone (C/CAG).

Absent from the meeting were: Merrill Buck, Howard Goode, Jon Lynch, John Lisenko, Marc Roddin, George Bagdon, April Chan.

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

None.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings.**

- Scope of Work For A Ramp Metering Study
- Transit Oriented Development criteria for employment centers
- Update on the process for developing projects to include in the reauthorization of Measure A
- Sacramento Budget implications
- Status Report on the Countywide Congestion Relief Plan
- Review and Approval of Specific Comments on the Design of the BART/SAMTRANS Bikeways Project
- Review and Approval of the Appointment of Adrienne Tissier, Council Member - Daly City, and Sepi Richardson, Council Member - Brisbane, to the Congestion Management and Air Quality Committee
- Review and Approval of the Appointment of Gene Gonzalo Representing CalTrans, to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- Recommendation to Support Efforts to Ensure that 100% of the Vehicle License Fee (VLF) Backfill Allocations to Local Jurisdictions are Maintained
- Review and Approval of the Appointment of Cathy Baylock, Council Member - Burlingame, to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Review and Approval of Reauthorization of the City/ County Association of

Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) Including the Joint Powers Agreement and Transmittal to the Cities and County

- Positions and Update on Legislation

3. **Minutes from January 16, 2002 meeting.**

*Motion: To approve the minutes as presented. Unanimous.*

4. **Process for developing projects to include in the reauthorization of Measure A.**

The following comments were made on the suggestions made at the last meeting. The new comments are in ***bold italics***.

- The Transportation Authority has hired a public education/outreach consult to assist in the process of getting information out to the public regarding the reauthorization of Measure A.
- Staff would like to finalize the process for developing the draft program of projects (expenditure plan) by the next TAC meeting.
- Input from all Public Works Directors to this process is very important. They will all be encouraged to attend the TAC meetings where this item will be discussed.
- The list of potential transportation projects developed through this process should also be used to solicit monies outside of Measure A. ***such as TEA-21 and STIP.***
- The list of projects will likely be updated every year. ***including the project priorities and cost estimates. Once the projects are included in the expenditure plan they cannot be changed.***
- Joe and Geoff presented a draft calendar for creating the expenditure plan.
- In order to be included in the ballot measure to reauthorize Measure A, the list of projects must be fully developed by June 30, 2003. ***This means that the input from the cities/County must be firmed up on the projects by this date.***
- Projects of all sizes will be considered.
- The final list of projects must be signed off on by the appropriate boards (C/CAG and the Transportation Authority) by March 31, 2004 in order to complete the process in time for a November 2004 consideration by the voters.
- The Board of Supervisors and City Councils must approve the ballot measure by August 2004 in order to be placed on the ballot for November 2004.

Comments by the TAC included:

- Grade separation projects should be listed as a subset of the CalTrain program and should be the responsibility of the Joint Powers Board to manage instead of this burden falling to the cities. ***By a vote of 10 to 3 it was decided to keep grade separations as a separate category for now. The questions of where to build them and what entity will manage the projects can be decided at a later date. It was suggested that the work on the local streets be handled by the local jurisdiction and the Joint Powers Board do the work on the rail line.***
- The category for bus services should be expanded to include the new C/CAG Local Transportation Services Program. This would provide another funding source for shuttles

and other transportation that supplements and supports the SamTrans regional bus program. ***This category should be broadened to include all shuttles and be called Transportation Demand Management Programs.***

- A question was raised as to whether the grade separation projects will be designed to accommodate four rails. ***The answer is Yes.***
- The question was raised as to whether including a category for BART implies that BART will be extended past Millbrae. ***This will be a political decision that may be determined based on the outcome of public opinion polls. There was a great deal of discussion as to whether the category should be limited to a study only or for a rail corridor north of Millbrae only, or split into two rail corridors north and south of Millbrae. Minimally funding will be needed to study the future extension of BART further. It was agreed to leave this category open for now.***
- It was suggested that rail funding be identified for the corridor without designating the type of technology that will be employed (BART versus other technologies).
- By including a BART category, it implies that San Mateo County has agreed to be a BART County. This is a matter for the voters to decide as a separate item
- Is the money contemplated for BART, to be used for the extension of the line or for the operation of the current portion of the line that is in San Mateo County? ***See discussion on prior question about BART extension.***
- Should high-speed rail be included? ***High-speed rail will be included only if a specific project is proposed. If so it will likely be proposed by the Joint Powers Board.***
- Should a category for intermodal improvements be included? ***This is already covered in the other categories.***
- Is the purpose of the expenditure program to be a way to divide up the pie or to do a real regional plan? ***Its main purpose is to convince the voters to support transportation improvements.***
- The C/CAG Countywide Transportation Plan ***plus the CalTrain and SamTrans Strategic Plans*** should be used as the official plan to guide what should or should not be included in the expenditure plan.
- The funding for BART should be for a study only. Until it is decided whether BART will be extended further, it is premature to include anything beyond a study in this expenditure plan.
- The Transportation Authority education and outreach study will attempt to poll and identify the needs expressed by the residents.
- There was general consensus that the proposed list is good enough to stimulate discussion on the process.
- Projects proposed for the list should ~~only be nominated~~ ***be sponsored*** by the cities, the County, the Transportation Authority, SamTrans, the JPB, and CalTrans.
- Consideration should be given to creating a separate category for incentives.
- Transit Oriented Development is not consistent with any of the other categories; therefore it should be a separate category and not related to a specific transportation project. ***The definition of TOD should be focused to show that it is for allowable transportation improvements.***
- Incentives and Transit Oriented Development could be placed under the TSM category.
- ~~Consider calling it Multimodal incentives instead of Transit Oriented Development.~~
- The focus should be on corridors and not the method of travel. There can be a sample of

the types of project but not a specific and limited list of projects.

- The bicycle and pedestrian category should be for capital projects and not for studies. The local agencies should pay for the studies. ***There was general agreement on this statement.***
- It will be difficult to anticipate the specific project needs over the next 20 years. A lot can change over that period of time. It would be better to have the flexibility to adjust the projects as the needs become better defined.
- It will be harder to get voter approval if the Measure does not include a specific list of projects.
- The cost estimates for the candidate projects should be done in today's dollars.
- The money under the reauthorized Measure A program will not become available until ~~2008~~ **2009** and later.
- The Countywide Transportation Plan presumes that the Measure A funds will be married with state and federal dollars. Local funding would be considered separate and in addition to these funds.
- There needs to be clarification on the types of projects that can be submitted for consideration.
- It was recommended that the project ideas be solicited first and only the likely candidates go through a detailed ~~cost-estimating~~ **engineering and design** process.
- It was recommended that the solicitation of projects be kept informal as first until further direction is developed and some of the ideas are submitted. Consider doing this initial part as a brainstorming process to be followed by developing project specifics and cost estimates for the more likely candidates.
- Local streets projects are not being solicited at this time.
- Consider ignoring the categories and just collect the projects first. Let the project submissions be the method for developing the categories.

It was requested to continue discussion on this item at the March meeting.

#### **5. Sacramento budget implications.**

Nothing new to report. The stalemate in Sacramento continues.

#### **6. SamTrans strategic plan presentation – Market Research Study.**

Corinne Goodrich and Dianna Lee made a power point presentation on the process and outcomes of a recent study on transit habits and preferences in San Mateo County. A copy of the power point slides is attached to these minutes.

#### **7. Recommendations for the implementation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle of the “Local Transportation Services” component of the Countywide Congestion Relief Plan.**

This item will be brought back to the TAC at a future meeting.

#### **8. 2003-04 Transportation Fund for Clean Air program design recommendations.**

The recommendations presented by staff were to maintain the existing program that includes shuttles from BART stations to employment centers operated by SamTrans, a shuttle from CalTrain in Menlo Park to the downtown and other parts of the city operated by the City of Menlo Park, and the Countywide Transportation Demand Management program operated by the Congestion Relief Alliance. The two changes recommended for next year's program are to refund the SamTrans shuttle program without a request for proposals. The second change is to fully fund the Alliance program from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air allocation so that funding from C/CAG member assessments can be saved to fund additional local service programs under the Congestion Relief Plan.

*Motion: To approve the Program as presented. Unanimous.*

**9. Items of interest/new business.**

- TAC members were requested to secure recommendations of support from their jurisdictions for maintaining the State backfill of the Vehicle License Fee for cities and counties.
- TAC members were requested to encourage their jurisdictions to support ACA 10, which will provide an exemption from Proposition 218 for storm water management programs.
- TAC members were introduced to a position paper from the Bay Area Partnership on improving the joint planning of land use and transportation programs.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

NOTE: COPIES OF HANDOUTS FROM MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST BY CONTACTING WALTER MARTONE AT 599-1465.